

## **Geographic Review Panel 3 – American River/Eastside Tribes**

**Proposal number:** 2001-I212

**Short Proposal Title:** Non-Reg Mechanisms to  
Alter Dams and Diversions

**1. Applicability to CALFED ERP Goals and Implementation Plan and CVPIA priorities, and relevance to ERP and CVPIA priorities for your region.** The proposed scope of work is directly applicable to CALFED goals 1, 3, 4 and 6, and indirectly to CVPIA goal (b). Within this region, this proposal could affect flows, temperatures, or fish passage in many of the watersheds. For example, this proposal could be critically important for the Middle and South Fork Yuba rivers.

**2. Linkages/coordination with previously funded projects or other restoration activities in your region.** This next-phase project will support CALFED and CVPIA investments and partnerships in restoration projects, habitat acquisition and restoration, water rights/flow acquisitions, and will directly impact CALFED-identified limiting factors and stressors on the ecosystems.

**3. Feasibility, especially the project's ability to move forward in a timely and successful manner.** Yes. The first project phase was influential, suggesting a high likelihood that the second phase will be as well. The second phase project proposal demonstrates an intent to build upon and expand the partnerships and collaborative relationships developed during phase one. The project is extremely timely and time-sensitive; it is coinciding with the key decisions at the PUC and elsewhere that will be made of the next 12 months.

**4. Qualifications of the applicants and others involved in implementing the proposed project.** The project applicants are well qualified to implement the proposed project.

**5. Local involvement (including environmental compliance).** The proposed project has broad-based support at local and national levels. Environmental compliance is not applicable to the scope of work proposed.

**6. Cost.** The requested \$39,000 represents 47% of the total project budget of \$79,000. The budget appears extremely reasonable given the proposed scope of work and narrow window of project opportunity.

**7. Cost sharing.** Yes, 53% of the requested funding. The project applicant notes that matching funds from three potential cost-share awards in the amount of \$35,000 were still pending as of the PSP submittal date.

**8. Additional comments.** This Panel agreed not to deal with the policy implications of funding this project because the Panel felt that such was outside the purpose of their review. The Panel also observed that legislators were likely harder to educate than farmers.

---

## **Regional Ranking**

**Panel Ranking:** High

**Provide a brief explanation of your ranking:** The principle goal of this project is to inform and educate the legislature, state and federal decision makers, the PUC and the people of California about the impending divestiture of PG&E facilities (next 12 months) and the environmental consequences and options available to protect the watersheds and restoration projects downstream of the divested facilities. The proposed scope of work has the potential (at minimum) to protect a 140,000 acres of watershed for an insignificant investment.

Recommend the proposed scope of work be fully funded, and that the funding request be increased by the amount necessary, up to a maximum of \$35,000, to cover any unrealized funds from the pending cost-share partners.